

REMARKS

While the Blume citation and applicant's invention do have some similar broad objectives of supplementing a book, newspaper or magazine reader with material accessed by a pointing device interacting with locations on the printed page, this is where any similarity between the two techniques and structures ends. They actually proceed along very different lines to achieve some common, but also very different results.

To start out with, Blume must use a "coordinate detection mechanism and configuration of . . . special paper" that is not at all required or used by applicant who deals only with the conventional printed book pages without any coordinates thereon visible or invisible. Inherent in the Blume technique is the requirement, moreover, for the pointer to detect coordinate grid locations on the special paper page or substrate.

No such coordinate grid or location detection is required or used in applicant's invention.

Blume also includes a feature producing "a spoken representation of words on the page", which again is not an objective and is not at all involved in applicant's very different operation. The applicant's system does not turn the printed words into a spoken representation nor does it translate the same into such.

In fact, the applicants "pointing device" is not used either to scan the printed passages or to interact with a location on the printed page as in Blume, but rather is a

code reader that is applied to read the coded indicia that applicant places on a page near a printed passage.

The applicant, unlike Blume, provides for supplemental visual (and optionally audio) material to what is actually printed in the various passages of the printed book pages that expands upon and supplement the subject matter of the various passages printed on the book page -- such supplementary material not being a duplication of anything in the printed passages in the book. In applicant's system the supplemental visual material, for example, is stored on coded tracks of a recorder storage medium player available to the book reader. This is in no sense the same as the actual printed "words on a page" that Blume uses and in some cases Blume desires be converted into audio format and heard by the reader.

In applicant's system, to the contrary, track selection of the player is controlled by a transmitter wand which responds to the reading of the indicia code contents of the special indicia in response to the electronic reader being applied to such selected indicia that commands the electronic wand to signal play back to the player of the respective coded track. The wand - transmitted signal then controls the actuation of the player to play the desired supplemental information track selected by the book reader.

While, in one embodiment, Blume suggests the possible use of OCR capabilities, he distinctly points out that he can not use OCR techniques in the manner used by applicant; namely, to retrieve the contents in the coded indicia to control the wand transmitter selection of track. Blume makes this very clear that:

“it is important to remember that even with OCR, the system still uses the X/Y location detection to determine the desired output. This system is distinct from the use of OCR alone because it works on any content, text, symbols and pictures. This invention (i.e. Blume’s) works with any content because it is not really reading the content, it is simply reading location on the page, and transmitting that to a reference database for the book.”

Applicant quite to the contrary distinctly requires the reading by an electronic wand of the content of the coded indicia since it is that decoded content that commands the wand to transmit the desired track selection to the medium player.

Though having considered that the original claims, define this different operations of structure and technique applicant has amend the claims even more clearly to distinguish Blumes coordinate pointing. Claim 1, for example, not only recites, first, that the supplemental material featured on the tracks “is not duplicative” of the printed passages in the book; but specifies that the electronic reader unlike in Blume, extracts from the contents of the coded indicia the identification of the respective track and actuates the electronic wand “in response to reading of said indicia content” to command the wand transmitter to signal play back of the identified respective track.

Similar amendments have been incorporated in all the other claims such as to more clearly distinguish over the reference.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-14, 16, and 20-31 under 35 USC 102 are therefore respectfully requested.

As for the Section 103 rejection of claims 17-19 these claims also embody the same distinguishing amendments. They should now be allowable as well.

Applicant's accompanying Terminal Disclaimer would appear to obviate the rejection of claims 1-8, 9-20, and 21-24 – upon provisional double patenting ground of rejection.

Reconsideration of allowance of claims 1-31, particularly as amended, thus appear to be in order and their allowance is accordingly respectfully requested.

Any costs for this amendment, and terminal disclaimer and any required time-extension fees, petition for which is hereby made, are to be charged to Deposit Account No. 18-1425 of the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

RINES AND RINES

By: 

Robert H. Rines

Registration No. 15,932

Customer No. 41840

Date: May 23, 2008  
RINES AND RINES  
81 North State Street  
Concord, NH 03301  
Tel: (603) 228-0121